

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed on April 3, 2009. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6, 8-25, and 31-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reed et al. (US Pub. 2005/0154785; hereinafter “Reed”) in view of Lior (US Pub. 2003/0220925; hereinafter “Lior”) in further view of Casati et al. (US Pub. 2005/0080661; hereinafter “Casati”) in further view of Halim et al. (US Pub. 2004/0111504; hereinafter “Halim”) in further view of Karakashian et al. (US Pub. 2007/0150546; hereinafter “Karakashian”).

There rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner may not disregard specific recitations of Appellants’ claims to maintain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). According to the M.P.E.P., “[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. ch. 2143.03 (Rev. 6, Sep. 2007) (emphasis added). Moreover, “[w]hen evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, all the limitations of the claims must be considered and given weight.” *Id.* As shown above, even assuming for the sake of argument that the proposed combination of the 5 references were proper, the proposed combination of the 5 references would still fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all the limitations recited in the independent claims, as explained below. Therefore, the proposed combination of the 5 references does not render the independent claims obvious.

With respect to independent claims 6 and 22, first, the outstanding office action does not indicate that the 5 references, either individually or in combination, disclose the cited limitation: “presenting, in a user interface, one or more of the web service identifiers and corresponding transaction counts, wherein the user interface allows for selection of one or more web service identifiers”.

The outstanding office action states that: (1) Reed does not disclose this limitation; (2) Lior teaches network traffic classification; (3) Casti teaches transaction corresponding to one or

more web services and transaction count associated with the web service; (4) Halim teaches configuring a network traffic classification mechanism to ...; and (5) Karakashian teaches discovering web services based on web service invocation messages. Thus, nowhere in the outstanding office action indicates that any of the 5 references discloses the above limitation.

Second, the 5 references, either individually or in combination, do not disclose the cited limitation: “configuring, *responsive to selection of a web service identifier*, a network traffic classification mechanism to identify the *web service* corresponding to the web service identifier ...”. Note that the selection of the web service identifier is done through the user interface.

The outstanding office action alleges that Halim teaches this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. First, Halim does not disclose that the configuration is performed *in response to a selection of a web service identifier through a user interface*. Furthermore, Halim discloses the profiling, clustering and categorizing of *web sites*, not *web services*. In paragraph 27, Halim explicitly states that “traffic data is complied and used to profile, cluster and categorize web sites.” In Abstract, Halim also states that the invention is for classifying *web sites*. *A web site is not a web service*. A web site is a collection of web pages. A web service, as defined by the W3C, is a software system designed to support interoperable machine-to-machine interaction over a network. Thus, classifying a web site is not the same as classifying a web service.

Third, Karakashian does not disclose the recited limitation: “*discovering* one or more web services based on web service invocation messages”. The outstanding office action alleges that Karakashian, in Fig. 4, discloses this limitation. First, there is no textual description of Fig. 4. Second, nowhere in Fig. 4 indicates that one or more web services are *discovered based on the received invocation messages*. Fig. 4 merely indicates that the message content is formatted and processed to generate response data.

Similarly, with respect to claim 37, the 5 references, either individually or in combination, do not disclose every limitation recited therein.

For above reasons, independent claims 6, 22, and 37 are patentably distinct from the 5 references. In addition, the currently pending dependent are patentably distinct from the 5

11 of 11

references for at least the same reasons as explained above with respect to claims 6 and 22.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all currently pending claims are presently in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application, the Examiner may call Bernadette Lee, Attorney for Applicants, at 650-739-7506.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts LLP.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTT'S L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Bernadette Lee
Reg. No. 60,298

Date: June 19, 2009

Correspondence Address:
Customer Number: **05073**